

# CHRISTIAN REPOSITORY.

Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.—Dan. xii. 4.

No. 30.

Saturday, November 3, 1821.

Vol. 1.

## For the Christian Repository.

THE limits of an essay for the Repository are too narrow to permit me to do ample justice to the important subjects under discussion, to give a clear idea of our principles to those who have had no better opportunity of acquiring a knowledge of them. The greatest difficulty I have had to encounter in the present controversy has been to condense the matter which appeared essential to a clear illustration of my subject. My opponent often complains of the length of my essays, and I confess not without reason—if they were much shorter, he would have sufficient ground to be dissatisfied—yet I wonder that he should venture to *express* his feelings on this occasion, whilst his own communications continue to be at least as long as mine.—Unmindful however of his complaint, I purpose to pursue my original plan, and make the best of my means to convey information to the candid enquirer on the subject of our principles.

Because "Amicus" said, that Matthew and John were the *only* Evangelists present at the feast of the passover which our Lord attended for the last time, "Paul" attempts to make his reader believe that I thought Mark and Luke mistaken in their accounts of this festival.—He "looks upon" my statement as "*an attack upon inspiration*," and begs me to excuse him for entertaining such a view.—On this account "Amicus" can easily excuse him. The interests of his carnal scheme are so deeply involved in the establishment of this idea, that he may well be pardoned for his attempt. The inspiration of the Apostles is inseparably connected with the authority of the sacred writings, that if Amicus doubted on this point, all his arguments might be rejected—but this *finesse* of my opponent cannot avail—the whole of my communications evidently shew—that I am no septic in the case. I have not only admitted the authority of the Scriptures, but I have contended with my opponent for their *exclusive* authority, as the only legitimate evidence of doctrinal truth. When I mentioned the total silence of the Apostle John on the subject of the Eucharist, I did not mean to infer that the testimony of the other Evangelists was incompetent to establish the fact, that "*our Lord used some expressions peculiar to that occasion*." The only inference that I intended—I yet see no reason to condemn—which is, that "If the Evangelist had believed (as my opponent does) that Christ at that time had instituted a new ordinance binding upon Christians—to be observed in the church to the end of time—to be a badge of christianity and a seal of grace" he would not have omitted to mention a fact of so much importance. The truth is that John wrote his Gospel in the maturity of religious experience, when the inconsistency of carnal ordinances with the Christian dispensation was clearly manifest to his enlightened understanding. In all his writings he never mentions one word on the use of Bread and Wine as a religious act. If, as my opponent observes "his Gospel was intended as a supplement to the other Gospels" he ought to have been the more particular on this subject, seeing none of his predecessors mention the use of these elements as a new Institution, nor give us the least reason to believe that Christ meant to perpetuate it in his church. All the plausible arguments used to prove it a *standing ordinance* hang upon this one expression of Luke "This do in remembrance of me," a very incompetent foundation for the gorgeous superstructure which the sacramentaries have erected upon it. As I have before observed, the command of our Lord is in the present tense "This do"—Do what? take the bread which I have given you and eat it in remembrance of me—let your attention be directed to its spiritual import—"This bread is my Body"—it represents my mystical flesh, which is given for the life of the world—"This cup is the new Testament in my blood"—it represents the new covenant, the administration of the Spirit, my spiritual blood "which is shed for you." Matthew says "this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins." To those who recur to the original meaning of the word "Testament" the import of these expressions must be obvious—A "Testament, signifies a compact, a covenant—the blood of the new covenant is the Holy Spirit, the powerful operation of which on the soul of man purifies it from all iniquity, and remits, not only

the guilt, but the power of sin. This "new covenant" is expressly described by the Apostle in his Epistle to the Hebrews, as the ministration of the "holy Spirit," the "law written in the heart." See Heb. viii. 8. &c.

The attentive reader of Evangelical History must have observed that it was the common practice of our Lord to give a spiritual meaning to outward objects—to direct the attention of his hearers to the divine import of natural things.—Thus, to the woman of Samaria, who seemed to have a religious veneration for Jacob's well, he spoke of "living water" "If thou knewest the gift of God and who it is that saith unto thee, give me to drink, thou wouldest have asked of him and he would have given thee living water." John iv. 10. When she spoke of outward places of worship, he immediately directed her attention to spiritual worship, "Woman believe me, the hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem worship the Father.—The hour cometh and now is when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in truth." John iv. 21, 23.—Again, When the multitude sought him for the sake of the bread with which he miraculously fed them, he rebuked them for their carnal religion, and turned their views to "heavenly bread"—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, ye seek me not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled!—Labor not for the meat that perisheth but for that which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you. I am the bread of life." John vi. 26, 27, 48.

When they told him of the manna given in the wilderness, he replied "Moses gave you not that bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven, for the Bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." John vi. 32, 33.—I could cite many more passages to illustrate this view, but I wish to be as brief as the nature of my concern will admit, and think it unnecessary.

Thus we see that our Lord sought frequent opportunity to turn the attention of his followers to divine and spiritual objects: my opponent pursues a different course—he takes much pains to direct our views from spiritual to carnal objects to induce us to turn from the divine reality, and embrace the shadow—to depend upon "meats and drinks and divers washings" as "important means of salvation"—But it will not do—Christ remains to be the immediate and only "author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him," Heb. v. 9. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh"—outward ordinances can only operate on physical matter—they cannot reach the soul—they may be observed by the unregenerate and the wicked—they are consequently no "Badge of Christianity" nor "seal of grace." The views of my opponent on this subject are irrational and unscriptural—they are derogatory to the divine nature of Christianity, they are calculated to do infinite mischief by creating a false dependence on things that cannot profit the soul, they lead the mind from the only adequate power of salvation, to lifeless forms and inefficient ceremonies.

When Christ called the bread "his body" and the cup the "new testament in his blood"—he was only pursuing his usual course; he was simply directing the attention of his disciples to divine objects. Sitting with them at the Passover supper, and being about to leave them, he gave them the parting advice of a dying friend—advice, when rightly understood, more important in its nature than had ever flowed from human lips. It was an admonition to mind spiritual things, to remember the only proper nourishment of the soul, "the meat that endureth unto everlasting life," the "new wine of the kingdom," the animating principles of all true piety.

I have before stated that the Apostle John has never in any of his writings mentioned one word on the use of bread and wine as a religious act. "Paul" says in XII address to us, No. 27, Christian Repository, that John "does allude to this ordinance, and pays it a high compliment in his first Epistle v—8 making it a standing witness for Christ." And there are three that bear witness in Earth, the spirit the water and the blood—he omitted to add "and these three agree in one," but how the Evangelist in this text pays the ceremony of

eating bread and wine, "a high compliment," I am utterly at a loss to determine—the weakness of such an argument tends rather to injure than support a weak cause.

I come now to consider the Testimony of the Apostle Paul on this subject—"the fourth witness" summoned by my opponent. An attentive perusal of the 11th chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians will I apprehend convince any unprejudiced reader that its enlightened author was not very friendly to this ceremony—but as "Paul" considers the passage of great importance to him, I will endeavor more particularly to explain my views of it, and to shew, that when closely examined, it affords no solid argument in favor of perpetuating the use of bread and wine as a religious act. That the Corinthians were in the practice of this ceremony has been admitted—a fact, which, in the carnal and contentious state of that church, does not speak much in its favor. Their practice, unless they acted under divine authority, furnishes us with no warrant to follow their example. My opponent strives to prove that the Apostle introduced it amongst them, but he is unsuccessful, as I shall endeavor to show.—He asserts that "the Apostle declared that he received this ordinance of the Lord Jesus"—but how he should receive an ordinance from Christ which our Lord never instituted is somewhat mysterious! The Apostle however "declares" no such thing—he says "I have received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you—that the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread and when he had given thanks, he brake it and said—take eat this is my body which is broken for you &c." Now, the question is—What did the Apostle receive?—clearly nothing but a narration of matters of fact, in nearly the same words as the Evangelists record them. And what did he deliver?—precisely the same that he received! He only related the circumstances that occurred at the passover supper. He did not assert that he was commanded either to imitate this transaction himself or to cause them to imitate it; and this was essentially necessary to its institution as an ordinance. To assert that the words "This do in remembrance of me" is such a command, is miserably to beg the question. These words were a part of the narration, the very same recorded by Luke. They were the words of our Lord, not to Paul, but those who sat at table when they celebrated the Jewish Passover—and (as I think has been clearly demonstrated) never were intended as the ground-work of a new carnal ordinance—the type or figure of a figure or type.

But we have other, and as I conceive, irrefutable evidence that the Apostle never delivered this as an ordinance to the Corinthians. In the second verse of the same Chapter in which he so severely reproves them for their scandalous conduct in the performance of this ceremony—he praises them for the right observance of the ordinances which he delivered to them. 1 Cor. xi. 2. "Now I praise you brethren that you remember me in all things and keep the ordinances as I delivered them unto you." Let us now for a moment suppose that the Eucharist, as it is termed, was one of these ordinances—and what is the consequence? It is either that the Apostle said was not true, or that he established an institution to promote gluttony and drunkenness. If the Eucharist was one of them, he at the same time praises them for keeping it as he delivered it unto them, and severely rebukes them for keeping it in the most disgraceful manner!!! 1 Cor. xi. 17, 21, 22. "Now in this I declare unto you I praise you not, that ye come together not for the better but for the worse"—"for in eating every one taketh before other his own supper, and one is hungry and another is drunken! What have ye not houses to eat and to drink in, or despise ye the church of God, and shame them that have not! What shall I say unto you?—Shall I praise you in this? I praise you not." Upon the hypothesis of my opponent, the Apostle is a most contradictory writer—which I am not willing to believe.

There has hardly ever been a subject of dispute in the church, which has occasioned so much division, contention and bloodshed as this useless ceremony. Scisms, suffering, and disgrace to the professors of christianity, mark its progress. It began after the in-



stitution of christianity with the mistaken Corinthians. Its birth was signalized by heresies and drunkenness—its maturity is famous for its faggots and its fires—its old age for weakness and imbecility. See 1 Cor. xi. 19. 21. Also Fox's Acts and Monuments. And what has christianity gained by it, to compensate for all these disadvantages? This is a most important query. Let the serious candid christian deeply ponder it, and solemnly answer it to his own heart.

I will now recur to the subsequent part of the XI. chap. 1. Cor. and attempt to answer my opponent's arguments, founded on some expressions of the Apostle, who, he says, "attaches great importance to the observance of this ceremony"—"Whosoever eateth this bread, and drinketh this cup of the Lord, unworthily shall be guilty of the Body and blood of the Lord"—"Such unworthy communicants bring upon themselves divine judgments even sickness and death"—"to suppose all this importance attached to the use of an uncommanded useless ceremony is to suppose the Apostle acting a solemn farce." But we will neither admit this supposition, nor its consequence, for reasons which shall be shewn. When an individual practices any religious ceremony whatever, whether it be authorized by the precepts of the Gospel or not—whether it be eating bread and drinking wine, whether it be offering burnt sacrifices, or pouring out drink offerings—if he perform it unworthily—knowing that he is not in a state of repentance, he involves himself in the greatest guilt—he is acting the hypocrite, not only before men, but in the more immediate presence of his Creator—he is said to be guilty of the Body and blood of Christ, because, he is in the same state of mind as they who crucified the Lord of glory. The Apostle however does not, as my opponent asserts "attach great importance and solemnity to the observance of this ceremony,"—he attaches the great importance to the hypocritical practice of it, and he might with equal truth have attached great importance to the hypocritical offerings of any disciple of Moses. "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself," ver. 29. And likewise he that offereth a Burnt offering unworthily, offereth violence to his own soul. The degenerate Jews in the time of Isaiah made such offerings and were severely reprov'd: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me, saith the Lord, bring no more vain oblations—incense is an abomination unto me—the new moons and the sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with, it is iniquity," Isaiah. I. 11, 13. From the expressions of the Apostle quoted by my opponent, no conclusion can justly be drawn in favour of typical ordinances. He found the Corinthians in a low carnal state—attached to outward shadowy ceremonies—he did not forbid the use of them, because, they were too weak to bear it—he who circumcised Timothy in condescension to the Jews, indulged the Corinthians in a practice which they could not yet abandon. For all this he gives us a very satisfactory reason, "And I brethren could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal even as unto babes in Christ—I have fed you with milk and not with meat for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet are ye now able, for ye are yet carnal." 1 Cor. III. 1, 2, 3.

For want of room to pursue the subject further at this time, I will conclude with some observations on a part of "Paul's" last address to us, which relates to "Water Baptism;" my remarks on the remainder I will leave for a future number.

My opponent says "Now in the practice of Water Baptism the Apostles either were or were not mistaken. Let Amicus take which side he please his system must fall. If he holds they were mistaken, he so far denies their inspiration."—"If he holds they were not mistaken he admits the propriety of their practice and thus gives up his whole argument. This statement puts one in mind of the old Spanish proverb "When a man gets wrong he needs good Eyes." My heedless opponent has run himself into the toils he had laid for me, and contradicts himself. "It is a fact that the Apostles practised Circumcision, legal vows and Jewish Sacrifices. Now in this practice they either were or were not mistaken—let "Paul" take which side he please he gets entangled in his own Net—If he admits that they were mistaken he so far denies their inspiration—if he holds they were not mistaken he admits the propriety of the practice, & upon his own principles, we are now bound to practice and perpetuate circumcision and other Jewish Ordinances in the Church of Christ!! In contending for the unlimited inspiration of the Apostles in all their practices, "Paul" plainly contradicts himself. In his 9th. address, C. R. No. 21. he says expressly that "the Apostle Paul in offering sacrifices at Jerusalem at the request of James, acted contrary to his own judgment and the judgment of James, and that this was a weak compliance with Jewish prejudices." He says that "Paul circumcised Timothy because of the Jews," and that "Peter disapproved his own weakness" in compelling the Gentiles to live according to the Law! Now I would ask, was Paul inspired to act contrary to his own judgment? was James inspired when he requested Paul to offer sacrifices at Jerusalem in a weak compliance

with Jewish prejudices? was Paul inspired to circumcise Timothy, or did he do it because of the Jews? was Peter inspired "not to walk uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel?" and if he were so, was Paul inspired to withstand him to the face because he was to be blamed? or, was Barnabas inspired when he was carried away with the dissimulation of Peter and the other Jews? See Gal. II. 11, 12, 13, 14. My opponent's system is a mass of incongruity and self contradiction! it falls to pieces for want of cement; it has neither symmetry of design, nor coherence of parts.

To suppose that the Apostles were always under the immediate influence of divine inspiration, is irreconcilable with the whole tenor of their history. They were men of like passions with us—they were subject to weaknesses and prejudice and sometimes acted under their influence. Their religious judgment was not matured in a day. They advanced by a regular progression in the knowledge of divine things to the state of manhood in Christ. All that the Christian can rationally or consistently contend for in order to establish the authority of—THE HOLY SCRIPTURES is that they were "given by inspiration of God," that however the Apostles may in their practice have manifested the infirmity of our common nature, yet that when they wrote to the churches they wrote under the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit.

Thus we see that "Amicus" can, consistently with the sacred Writings admit the fallibility of the Apostles, can grant that they were not perpetually inspired without "giving up his whole argument" or any portion of it—without "the fall of his system or the injury of its parts."

AMICUS.

#### ERRATA.

In No. 22, 86th page, 3d column, 19th line from top, for "eternal" read "internal" No. 26, 101st page, 1st column, 30th line from top, for "Paul," read "Saul." No. 28, 109th page, 3d column, 11th line from bottom, for "Scriptural," read "Spiritual."

Extract from "the Narrative of the revival of religion, within the bounds of the Presbytery of Albany," drawn up by a committee of that body, and published by their order.

Continued from No. 29.

#### BALLSTON.

Of Ballston, your committee need say but little, as there has been a report published, which has put you in possession of all the important facts relating to the origin, progress and present state of the awakening in that place. Nor would they deem it expedient to make any report at all, were it not for the sake of connection.

The work of grace does not appear to have commenced in Ballston, until after it had begun to decline in Saratoga, and had nearly gained its height in Malta and Stillwater. At that time the people were very generally cold and careless, and were not free from serious apprehensions that they would be unable to retain their minister. But the Lord had mercy in store for them. The good news from Malta, Saratoga, and Stillwater, seemed to arouse some among them. Minister and Session, in free conversation, candidly confessed to each other their consciousness of many defects in the discharge of their several duties. They confessed and mourned over these in the presence of God, and entered into new engagements to be more faithful in future. They districted the congregation, and resolved to visit every house. They called together the church members, and conversed freely with them on the state of their hearts. They agreed to avoid all doctrinal disputation, and to attend to their own hearts, and so to let their light shine, that others seeing it, might be led to glorify their heavenly father. This was the beginning of January, 1820. Just about this time or a little previous to this, several of the session and others, attended the communion in Malta, and various other meetings in succession. Their hearts were greatly refreshed. They caught the holy flame of divine love, and returned home making the solemn inquiry, What do we here all the day idle? They commenced the work of domestic visits and personal conversation; and to their utter surprize, found the spirit of the Lord

working every where before them. They urged sinners to pray, and sinners complied! And while they were yet praying, the Lord heard them, and many an heart of hardness was broken and melted and removed! The heart of rebellious stoutness submitted! The heart of unbelief yielded! and while repentance melted down the most obstinate, they were led by the right hand of God's righteousness, to trust in the mercy of God and rest for acceptance and salvation on the righteousness of Jesus Christ. Some entire households were converted to God. Five children out of one family were born again. Convictions were deep, powerful and pungent, generally of short continuance when compared with those in other places. In eight months one hundred and sixty were added to the church; perhaps forty others cherished a hope in Christ. Sectarian folly, was evidently injurious to the awakening. We "know that offences must come," "but wo to" every one "by whom they come." Those who have been admitted to the fellowship of the church, are dwelling together in unity, cherishing a spirit of gospel peace. There has only one case of hopeless backsliding occurred. No tendency to error visible amongst them. Sabbath schools are greatly blessed; monthly concerts well attended; bible classes making a very encouraging progress; the young converts evidently learn faster than before they became pious.—There were seventy-six adults baptized.

Of the happy results of this awakening, we have to notice, that a female member of this church was led, in the dispensations of Divine Providence, to take charge of a female academy in South-Carolina. The young ladies under her care were of all ages, from eight to eighteen. On the Sabbath day she confined their attention to the Bible and Baxter's Saints Rest, and has had the unspeakable satisfaction of seeing twelve of her pupils brought to rejoice in Jesus, as their only Redeemer, and that too in one single week.

An example worthy of Imitation.—The author of the letter, from which the following is an extract, will doubtless excuse its publication, though done without his knowledge or consent; when he recollects the powerful influence of example on human conduct, and the probability that many may be induced to go and do likewise. The letter is addressed to the author of "A plea from the Theological Seminary at Princeton, (N. J. )" by a distinguished clergyman resident in one of the Eastern States, immediately after reading the plea.

#### EXTRACT.

"I have long felt deeply interested in the prosperity of the Theological School at Princeton. I was a member of the General Assembly, in 1812, when it was located, and shall never forget the interesting discussions of that day, nor the solemnity of the hour when the question was finally taken and decided. Although a Congregational minister, I received my theological education in the Presbyterian church; and, on many accounts, shall always feel attached to that denomination of Christians. At the same time, I do not mean to imply an indifference to my own denomination, nor to the theological school established in our own part of the country. I regret to learn the low state of your funds, and am desirous to afford you some little aid. I am inclined to do something for your seminary, more from the hopes that my example may induce others to do likewise, than from the expectation, that the little it is in my power to give, consistently with other numerous and pressing calls, will be of essential service to the institution. You will herewith consider me an annual subscriber for \$ 100 per annum, for ten years. In case of my decease during that period, I will make provision for the



payment of the entire sum; and should that provision, through any unforeseen dispensation of Providence, be prevented, you may consider this letter as a sufficient guarantee, and order upon my executors for the payment of the sum that may be due, which I have no doubt will be readily admitted. Below you will find an order for the payment of the first subscription, upon a house in New York.

JOURNAL OF THE MARINER'S CHURCH.

To the Editor of the Seaman's Magazine.

SIR—Knowing the interest you take in all the efforts that are made for the salvation of seamen, and your desire that God would make them instruments in carrying the Gospel throughout the world, I feel happy in informing you, in addition to what you have already received, of the blessed effects produced by the Mariners' Church, and the Bethel Union Society. At the stated meeting in the Mariners' Church, on Wednesday evening, 29th August, the following note was read by the Rev. Mr. Chase:—"I earnestly request, that prayers be offered up to Almighty God, that he will have mercy on my soul." (Signed "Richard Welling.") Mr. C. being present, stated he had visited him; that he was a seaman, in great distress in body and mind. Some very appropriate remarks were made on the note, and fervent prayers were offered up in his behalf. Being requested to call and see him, I was accompanied by Mr. C—to his boarding house, where I was soon satisfied the Lord had begun a blessed work in his heart. "Where did you receive the first impressions that you are a lost and undone sinner?" "In this house," was his answer. "Do you go to the Mariners' Church?" "I do." "Do you believe you ever received any benefit by going there?" "Yes, I do; on last Wednesday evening week, I was at the prayer meeting there, and an address, made by an old man,\* and the prayers offered up for seamen made me feel very solemn, but those feelings soon left me; but on Thursday and Friday I could not entirely forget them. On Friday evening last I was sitting below with my shipmates, and did not feel well: between eight and nine o'clock I was suddenly filled with horror about my soul—I could not sit where I was; I retired to a place alone, and the agony of my body for the concern of my soul was so great, the blood flew from my nose, and before it could be stopped, four quarts discharged from me, which made me very weak; and ever since, when I am in distress for my soul, it produces a discharge of blood. But I am now better: I can pray, which gives me some relief. But my prayers must be short." "Do you think, and believe your prayers are sincere?" "O Sir, I never had any thing that ever came from my heart with more sincerity. And I hope this sudden change in my heart will be followed with the same effects it had ten months ago on one of my shipmates while on our passage home to New-York. He was the profane man I ever saw, and always treated religion with awful contempt; and his parents the same, because they were pious. One day, while we were all forward, and he was blaspheming in the greatest degree, which made us all look at him with astonishment, he on a sudden stopped, and said, "O, what a sinner I am! I must pray, and you must not disturb me." He did pray three or four times every day all the passage home, and exhorted us all to do as he did, for we were all lost sinners; and he has not sworn one oath from that time to this. He has been here to see me, and he talks like a Christian, and I hope the Lord will deal with me as he hath with him."

\* Rev. Joseph Eastburn, of Philadelphia.

A captain H. received conviction of his sinful state in our Bethel meetings on board of vessels; and these convictions have now got to such a height that he is in great distress, and is anxious for the salvation of his soul.

I am, Sir, yours, &c  
C. P.

To the Editor of the Seaman's Magazine.

SIR—I know you will join in rejoicing with me and many others in the goodness and mercy of the Lord among our seafaring brethren. He has been convincing several, within the last fifteen days, "of sin, of righteousness, and a judgment to come." But yesterday, he permitted our eyes to see, and our ears to hear, that which was never seen nor heard in America, and perhaps in no part of the world before. As we have had morning and evening service only in the Mariners' Church for four or five Sundays past, we had a prayer meeting, commencing at two o'clock in the afternoon, and our intention was to continue one hour only. But yesterday week, and yesterday, we were under the necessity of continuing our exercises until 4 o'clock, on account of the number of seamen present, and the solemnity that pervaded every countenance. Yesterday, after praying, exhorting, singing, and reading some interesting communications, dismissed the audience, and invited all such to stay who wished to converse on the subject of their precious and immortal souls. Seventeen returned and took their seats, with countenances that depicted great distress of mind. After having engaged in prayer we began to converse with them individually, and not one out of all present could refrain from weeping, and some were so distressed they could not be pacified—one in particular, who was convicted on board the brig Phoebe Ann, at our Bethel meeting last Friday evening. I cannot describe the scene which presented itself to our view. It was pleasing, solemn, and affecting, to see such a number of weatherbeaten men, from 20 to 40 years of age, weeping all around us, crying, "what shall I do—I am a lost sinner—I know I deserve hell—I have abused the goodness of God." The fear of hell did not seem to terrify them as much as their sinning against God in various ways. Some had promised God, when in danger, if He would spare their lives, they would live devoted to him, and his holy religion; but they had despised these promises, and had been more wicked than before—their confessions were various, and mingled with grief and distress.

Yours, &c.

C. P.

**Slavery and moral power.**—If nothing else could render domestic servitude odious under our republican institutions, the perpetual contrast between the growth of the non-slave holding and the slave-holding states, is sufficient to cover it with reproach. There was a day, when Virginia was the first state in the Union. Not only did she pride herself on her talents, on the celebrity of her statesmen, her lawyers, and her jurists, but upon her moral strength and energy. But things are now changed. Compare Virginia with New York and Pennsylvania, and the vast disparity which appears, cannot but lead to a long train of painful reflections. Time has rolled on—the free states of the north and the west have flourished in a ratio unparalleled in civil history, while slavery has shackled the powers and retarded the advancement of our southern sisters. On the completion of another twenty years, New York will exhibit a population of three millions. Pennsylvania will be nearly as large, and Ohio will exceed the present population of N. York. In ten years, Ohio will pass Virginia in numbers; she already exceeds her in intrinsic strength.

We do not intend to excite hostile or unpleasant passions by these remarks. Their spirit was embraced in the last speech of Governor Randolph to the legislature of Virginia, which did equal credit to his head and his heart. Post.

CHRISTIAN REPOSITORY.

SATURDAY, November 3, 1821.

TO AMICUS.

WHAT subject you will discuss the present week, I know not; but think it probable you will not yet leave the former topics. I shall be happy to find you have at length given your views of the Scriptures and of Inspiration. As you appear to be exhausted on the subject of Baptism, and ought, by this time, to be willing to relinquish that of the Lord's Supper; if you will not give us your full sentiments on the Inspiration of the Scriptures, permit me to request your sentiments on another subject. You sometime since declared it to be your object to give a fair and candid statement of the principles of Friends, that the erroneous opinions of other sects concerning them might be corrected and removed. Now it is the opinion of the most judicious men of other sects, and so far as I can judge, has been the opinion of such ever since your society arose, that you do not hold the doctrine of the TRINITY. Without justifying the abusive epithets heaped upon you by Mosheim and his translator Maclaine, you are aware that both of them consider you as denying the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. Evans, in his "Sketch and Persuasion to Religious Moderation," says that on some "capital points of Christianity they have not yet explained themselves authentically." Neal, in his History of the Puritans, speaking of your Society in its earliest stages, says "they denied the received doctrine of the Trinity." And I know that many modern christians and divines entertain the same opinion. Now, if we are wrong, will you not set us right?

If I recur to your own writers, I find nothing but silence, or what is worse than silence on this subject—William Penn says just enough to show that he rejected the commonly received doctrine as a "gross notion," but no where tells us what he did believe upon the subject. Barclay in his long treatise of nearly 600 octavo pages, so far as I can find, never alludes directly to the subject! In his first chapter, after some preliminary remarks, he draws this conclusion, (quoted from another) "know that the main foundation of piety is this, to have right apprehensions of God"—and yet here the chapter ends!—He immediately passes to another subject, and thro the volume I do not observe a single hint of any thing like a distinction of Persons in the Godhead. Kersey in his Treatise written partly "for the information of such as are strangers to the Society of Friends," says not a word on this fundamental article of Christianity. Now to me this silence speaks volumes. Till lately it could not be proved against the Boston Socinians that they ever preached a word against the Divinity and Atonement of Christ; but it could easily be proved they said nothing in favour, or on the subject of these important doctrines. And they have since avowed their heresy. Tuke, one of your modern historians says, "some of the teachers of the Christian church, about 300 years after Christ, were led to form a doctrine to which they gave the name of Trinity." Does not this imply his rejection of the doctrine? Clarkson says you "seldom use the term" and reject it, as also the term "original sin," because "not found in the sacred writings." He quotes also Pennington and Crook (writers of your Society) as giving little information on the subject. The writer of this note has frequently heard your preachers, read your books, and examined your Apologies, Defences, Portraits, Treatises, Vindications, Refutations, and Histories, but does not recollect a single allusion which implied your belief of the doctrine in question,—a doctrine which lies at the very root of Christianity. The doctrine of the Trinity is openly disavowed by many in Wilmington who bear your name, and wear your livery; and one of your Leaders not long since declared "that he would as soon believe in THREE Persons as THREE Persons in the Godhead!" To me you appear to blend the works of the different Persons of the Godhead, making them all the works of the Spirit; you also bury the Holiness and Justice of God under the ever prominent attribute of Goodness. In short, you appear to me to believe and exhibit little more of the character of the Supreme, than what the Light of Nature teaches, entirely disregarding the additional light of the Scriptures.

Now will you be so kind and candid as to state the sentiments of your Society on this all important subject? In the hope you will thus favor me and the public generally, I will not occupy the Repository next week, but leave room for your communication.

PAUL.



Departed this life, at his seat in the City of Burlington, (New Jersey,) on the 24th day of October, A. D. 1824, ELIAS BOUDINOT, Esq. L. L. D. in the eighty-second year of his age.

On the 26th of October, his remains were committed to the tomb, followed by a large concourse of family-connections, and by the most respectable inhabitants of the city of Burlington. Among the mourning friends who attended on this occasion, was a deputation from the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society, consisting of, Gen. Clarkson, the Rev. Dr. Milnor, Messrs. S. Boyd, and Carow. The pall was borne by Gen. Bloomfield, William Coxe, and Joseph M. Ivaine, Esqs. of Burlington, and by Horace Binney, and Andrew Bayard, Esqs. and Dr. Mease, of Philadelphia. The body was conveyed to St. Mary's Church, where a very appropriate discourse was delivered by the Rev. Dr. Wharton, and the whole ceremony was conducted with solemnity, order and decorum.

Prior to the revolution, he was elected a member of the Board of Trustees of New-Jersey College. The semi-annual meetings of this respectable body he always attended with punctuality, unless prevented by severe indisposition. At the time of his decease, he was the Senior Member of this Corporation. The liberal donation he made it during life, and the more ample one in his last will, must be long remembered with gratitude by the friends of Science.—But while anxious to promote the interests of Science, he was not unmindful of the superior claims of Religion on his remembrance, and his bounty. Attached by principle and habit to the religious denomination of which he was so distinguished a Member, he has been most liberal in his testamentary donations to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, and to their Theological Seminary established at Princeton. But as his mind, unshackled by bigotry, or Sectarian prejudice, was expanded by the noblest principles of christian benevolence, he has also very liberally endowed various Institutions, whose object is to diffuse more widely the light of revealed truth—to evangelize the heathen—to instruct the Deaf and Dumb—to educate youth for the sacred ministry—to advance knowledge, and to relieve the wants and miseries of the sick, or suffering poor.

To those of his fellow citizens, however, who are peculiarly interested in the wide circulation of the Sacred Scriptures, perhaps the chief excellence in the character of the Deceased, is the ardent and effective zeal he displayed in the Bible Cause. The efforts he at first made, notwithstanding the infirmities of age, and much unexpected opposition, to establish the American Bible Society—his munificent donation to this Institution at its first organization—his subsequent liberality to aid in the erection of a Depository—the devise of a large and valuable tract of land—and the deep and undiminished interest he has taken in all the concerns of the National Society ever since he was chosen to be its President; while they spread his fame through every region of the globe, will consecrate his memory in the hearts of his fellow-citizens in America. And his fellow-christians throughout the world. But if his public services and his private worth claim the tribute of general esteem and affectionate remembrance, the closing scene of his life is no less calculated to console his friends under the heavy loss they have sustained; than it is to edify and support the departing christian. In the full possession of his mental faculties, and in the assured persuasion of his approaching dissolution—his faith was firm—his patience

unexhausted, and his hopes were bright. While with paternal solicitude he exhorted those around him to rest on the LORD JESUS CHRIST as the only true ground of trust—while, with solemnity and tenderness, he commended a dutiful and affectionate daughter, (his only child) to the care of his surviving friends, with humble resignation, he expressed his readiness—his “*desire to depart in peace*” to the bosom of his Father in Heaven: and the last prayer he was heard to articulate, was, LORD JESUS RECEIVE MY SPIRIT!

DIED, on the 21st of Sept. at his residence in Marietta, in the 45th year of his age, the Rev. WILLIAM KERR, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Donegal, in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. A few days before his dissolution, he was attacked with the disease, which this season has been very prevalent in many districts of our country. No danger was apprehended, no alarm was excited till about three hours previous to his dissolution. Debilitated, as it was supposed, principally by the operation of an emetic, he went to sleep about the usual time of retirement, and appeared to enjoy natural and refreshing rest. At 12 o'clock at night he awoke with a violent chill and exclaimed, “My days on earth are ended.” The little remaining time he employed in devout aspirations and fervent prayer. At 3 o'clock in the morning, he breathed his last.

With what emphasis and solemnity does Mr. Kerr's death say to all, & especially to the Ministers of the Gospel: “Be ye also ready; watch therefore, for ye know not what hour your Lord cometh, whether at even, or at midnight, or in the morning.” In Mr. Kerr's case literally “at midnight there was a cry heard: Behold the Bridegroom cometh, your Lord and master calleth for you, go forth to meet him.” How sudden! how solemn the summons! The call of death at any time, or under any circumstances is solemn. But the solemnity is increased when it is heard through the appalling darkness of the midnight hour, and amidst the confusion and alarm attendant on being suddenly awakened from sleep. Our confidence, however, is that for this scene, appalling and unexpected as it was, our Brother Kerr was prepared; and that he entered in with the Heavenly Bridegroom. He was an active and zealous preacher, a faithful and vigilant Pastor. With his co-presbyters he always united with cordiality and ardor in whatever plans he considered calculated to revive religion, and to promote vital piety and practical godliness. Mr. Kerr possessed good-natural talents and a considerable degree of classical learning. His death is deeply lamented by his friends in general and by his brethren in the Ministry; and by them his memory will be long and affectionately cherished, and especially by those, who knew him best. In his friendship he was ardent and steadfast; and possessing a peculiar swavity of manner he was a very interesting and agreeable companion. Constrained by the love of a Saviour, and a sense of the value of immortal souls, whatsoever his hands found to do, for the cause of the Redeemer and the salvation of sinners, he did with alacrity, diligence and zeal. He was faithful unto death, and we trust he has received a crown of life. Being suddenly called from his services upon earth, he unexpectedly, though not on that account the less joyfully, received his reward in heaven.

The following is part of a poem which was written by Mrs. Hastings, one of Mr. Kerr's parishioners shortly after his settlement at Donegal.

To the Rev. ———

“While on thy lips my listening soul attends,  
What varied passion in my bosom blends!”

Hope, fear, joy, grief, and love are all combin'd,  
To raise a pleasing tumult in my mind.  
Esteem and admiration both conspire;  
Thy subject those—thy merit, these inspire.  
While from your tongue the polish'd accents flow,  
I sink, I soar, I tremble, and I glow!  
Thy voice resistless bids the discord cease,  
And soothes the jarring passions into peace.  
Informed by thee my Muse essays to sing,  
Braces each nerve, and vibrates every wing.  
Thy glowing genius, kindling with thy theme,  
Touches the key, that wakes the soul to flame!  
New plum'd, she soars with faith and love refin'd,  
And leaves dull earth-born fancy far behind.  
To worlds unknown she takes her wondrous flight;  
Feels her own dignity and dares to rise  
To immortality, and claims the skies!  
Basks in the rays of full perfection high,  
And scorns a prize beneath Infinity.”

#### DISTRESSING ACCIDENT.

Bellefonte, Centre Co. (Penn.) Oct. 17.

On the 8th day of October, instant Judge Foster, of M'Kean county, was shot, accidentally, by his son. The circumstances relating to this melancholy event are as follows.—The son had left home for the purpose of hunting wolves: after he had been gone some time, the father went out for the same purpose. As it is common among hunters, one of them set up a howling after the manner of a wolf, and was answered by the other. They continued howling in this manner until they approached each other within very short distance. The father had hid himself behind a log, placing brush upon his back to disguise himself, so that when the wolf, (as he supposed) came near enough to shoot, it would not be frightened away. Having raised himself a little for that purpose, the son observing the motion, fired, taking the object fired at to be a wolf. The ball entered the right side of the neck and passed out at the left hip. The son finding what had happened took off his coat and placed it under his father's head, and started home for the purpose of getting aid, but his senses fled before he reached his father's residence; he became deranged and was found in that situation; not knowing, or having power, at that time, to relate the dreadful and heart-rending tale.

NEWARK, Oct. 23.

Suicide.—A most outrageous suicide was committed in this town on Sunday last by a young man whose name, is supposed to be Henry H. Newlove, who came to this county from Yorkshire, England, about a year ago. He died early yesterday morning, about 18 hours after receiving the wound. By a letter found in his possession addressed to a lady in the city of New-York, (which he made mention of in his dying moments,) it appears that this rash and wicked act was the result of disappointed love, connected with the want of employ and impoverished circumstances. His papers and effects are in the possession of Stephen Dodd, Esq.

#### GLORIOUS DAYS!

Of Bishop Porteus it is said, that only four days previous to his death, his Lordship enquired of one of his friends, and a particular friend of the Bible Society, who called upon him, how the Society was succeeding in some great town, in which it had been proposed; and on being informed that all denominations had embraced it with ardor, and that the church had taken the lead, a momentary glow of satisfaction flushed in his pallid cheeks, he raised himself on his chair, as if youth had been revived, and exclaimed, “Then you will see glorious days!”